

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed September 16, 2003, claims 4-5 and 15-17 have been cancelled, claims 14 and 21 have been amended and claims 22-26 have been newly added. Claims 1-3, 6-13 and 18-20 have been previously withdrawn. Accordingly, claims 14 and 21-26 are currently active in this Application.

Entry of the Amendments and Remarks is respectfully requested because entry of Amendment places the present application in condition for allowance, or in the alternative, better form for appeal. No new matters are believed to be added by these Amendments. Based on the above Amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the outstanding objections and rejections and they be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action, claims 4-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Publication No. 8-254680 to Kubo, *et al.* (“Kubo”) in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,219,125 issued to Ishikura, *et al.* (“Ishikura”) and further in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,008,065 issued to Lee, *et al.* (“Lee”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In this response, claims 4 and 5 have been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection over claims 4 and 5 be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claims 14-17 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants’ Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Kubo and further in view of Ishikura. This assertion is respectfully traversed.

In this response, claims 15-17 have been cancelled and claims 14 and 21 have been amended. Independent claim 14 recites:

“14. A liquid crystal display, comprising:
...
a gate wire ... comprises a first main layer and a first supplementary layer;
...
a data wire ... comprises a second main layer and a second supplementary layer;
...,
wherein *the first supplemental layer and the second supplemental layer are substantially inert to an etchant used for etching the transparent layer for preventing the gate pad and the data wire from being eroded by the etchant.*”

The Examiner admitted that AAPA fails to disclose or suggest (a) both the gate wire and the data wire comprising a main layer and a supplementary layer, and (b) the supplementary layers that are substantially inert to an etchant used for etching the transparent layer for preventing the gate pad and the data wire from being eroded by the etchant, as claimed.

Kubo fails to disclose or suggest (a) both the gate wire and the data wire comprising a main layer and a supplementary layer, (b) a transparent conductive layer is connected to the gate pad through a contact hole, and (c) the supplementary layers that are substantially inert to an etchant used for etching the transparent layer for preventing the gate pad and the data wire from being eroded by the etchant, as claimed.

Kubo is directed to a passive LCD device that has a substantially different structure from the claimed LCD device. More importantly, Kubo fails to disclose the supplementary layers that are substantially inert to an etchant used for etching the transparent layer for preventing the gate pad and the data wire from being eroded by the etchant, as claimed.

Thus, even if these cited references are combined, the result would still fail to disclose or suggest (a) both the gate wire and the data wire comprising a main layer and a supplementary layer, and (b) the supplementary layers that are substantially inert to an etchant used for etching the transparent layer for preventing the gate pad and the data wire from being eroded by the etchant, as claimed

Applicants respectfully submitted that the amendment made in claim 14 clearly differentiated from the cited references, and hence claim 14 is patentable over them. Claim 21 that is dependent from claim 14 would be patentable at least for the same reason. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 14 and 21 be withdrawn.

New Claims


In this response, claims 22-26 are newly added. Since claims 22-25 are dependent from independent claim 14, Applicants believe that they are also patentable over the cited references. Claim 26 recites “a gate wire ... comprises a first main layer and a first supplementary layer; ... a data wire ... comprises a second main layer and a second supplementary layer; ...”. Since none of the cited references discloses or suggests these claimed features, it is submitted that claim 26 is patentable over them.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, claims 14 and 21-26 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: January 15, 2004

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5365
Fax: 703-712-5280
HCP:WSC/jeh

\\COM\382774.1